The occasion, in the contemplation of the great tribunal cannot be the subject of definite prescription.

The honerable Serator remarked that if we wanted

Mexico, the treaty we have made could not restrain the ment? consent; her interest as well as ours may conform to the law of progress, to which the gentleman has so often alluded. That is, if we want Mexico, Mexico will be just as well prepared to accede to our terms as we are to hers to annul the treaty; or, if we want Cuba, it may be our interest to have it, or if another nation attempts to put her hand on Cuba against our policy or consent, what is the resort? War. We resert to it, as every other nation resorts to any measure of policy, under the sanction of its own judgment. Each mation is entirely the judge of its own rights. But, sir, what would be the justification of war? There is a higher tribunal than ourselves. I hope there is a tribunal in Heaven, to which nations will which we should look, and not to the tribunal that we may erect for our own pleadings upon a subject of this kind. but as the justice of the nations of the earth should regard them. Until some occasion should arise to justify the disregard of treaties, let us not inculcate a popular sen-timent that would reconcile it merely to our interests.

The gentleman has spoken on other topics, with a gushing exuberance well calculated to attract applause; but I fear also well calculated to excite prejudice and to exasperate national resentments. In speaking of the growth of his own country, he had much to justify him in his of England and the other nations of Europe, he spoke in a way well calculated to wound national sensibility; and especially so, when I cannot regard his opinions just. He said that decrepitude had come upon them in their decline and be ordered to be cleared, old age. They were the mere mouldering columns of an Mr. Adams. I desire edifice that had been; and as such their laws and policy could no longer shed light on the path of the young and vigorous people that, with Herculean strength, could throw off the shackles of European instruction. In this judgment, tempered with so much asperity, I am certain that he will find few that are impartial to concur with him. England may become our rival; but in her present strength and vigor of manhood, she cannot but command respect and consideration from all the other nations of the lit

fed; we must despise Hampden, and Sidney, and Chatham, and Shakspeare, and Burke. Will the Senator tell me that I am to despise them, or to hate England more It is not a word properly applicable to other nations. We opinions of different kinds. For some we have much ence, I avow it openly, that we have more sympathy with the spirit of a man judging the literature of England, I and are under deeper obligations to Great Britain than did not expect to be diverted by this miserable allusion law, literature, and free institutions, is our mother.

From what country do we derive the maxims, the spius? Have we not all drunk of them with delight and improvement? From what country do we get Magna Charta, trial by jury, the common law, with its hardy morality, inculcating all that has given liberty security? Sir, will the gentleman answer? I am willing, in all the arts of peace, in commerce, in literature, in science, in morals, to become the rival of England. But I can see no inducement, consulting national policy, to assume towards her the position of a hostile adversary. Remarks which have been made during this discussion are well calculated to sow the seeds of jealousy and hatred between the two countries—that is, unless there shall be Mr. Burner. I should like to know how England is tween the two countries-that is, unless good sense to have a true understanding of them when the national interests shall demand it; and I wish the occathe endorser of it? I have alluded to the masterly inthe two countries—that is, unless there shall be was about to say, I thought I could say it quite as national interests shall demand it; and I wish the occathe endorser of it? I have alluded to the masterly inthe two countries—that is, unless there shall be was about to say, I thought I could say it quite as national interests shall demand it; and I wish the occasion or war with Great Britain sooner than any other nation. There is not much patriotism, however, in a mere that to which he alludes is to be taken as a standard, abuse of her. But, Mr. President, as is sometimes the England is not the only place in which it is found. Shall be alluded in the control of the forty-two men who, on the control of the forty-two men

the controversy as to which is the right policy for the President when a treaty contains objects desirable and nation. details obnoxious, that he will find an example in point in the case of the Mexican treaty containing provisions her the preference. I have no eulogium to make upon which the President and Senate both regarded as unconher. I will treat her as our duty as a nation requires. stitutional, yet the President sent the treaty here, and pointed out the obnoxious parts. The Senator and those than history yields to her literature, commerce, and civiacting with him modified it, perfected it, voted for it, and ratified it in opposition to my vote, and it became the law | England if we intend to be a civilized nation ourselves of the land. It is a case precisely in point, and I merely I made no allusion to the kind of literature which the great character of Jackson, with his own party, in favor mention it, and leave that part of the question.

an entirety. We amended it no doubt, but it was sent as things which the Senator might as well have brought in, an entirety by President Polk, saying that Mr. Trist had which would have been as pertinent to the debate. usurped power which he did not possess. It was exactly had better get up a discussion of the Maine liquor law. one of those instances in which the treaty had been made. [Laughter.] I do not see why he should not. It has and he asked the Senate to adopt it, but he sent it in as about as much connexion with the question as the other.

Mr. Douglas. I have introduced into this discus-

ter of the late Secretary of State, (Mr. EVERETT,) and ed from that line except when compelled to do so by seems to suppose that we were advocating the doctrine of remarks of others. not observing the faith of treaties. That did not put us before the country in the true position which we have assumed. My position is this: that we should never make a treaty which we cannot carry into full execution; that good faith requires us not to make a treaty unless we intend to execute it, nor make one which we probably cannot be able to execute. My argument, therefore, was an argument against the making of treaties improperly upon points that were unnecessary, and which could not be carried into effect, and not in favor of violating any treaties that had been made. It was an argument in favor of the sanctity of treaties; and those who make treaties profusely and recklessly, binding us for all time to come without reference to the ability in future to execute them, are the ones who ought to be arraigned, if any body should be, for not being faithful to treaty stipulations. I wish, therefore, to make this explanation, in order that no misapprehension as to the position which I have assumed may be entertained in any quarter.

the excuse for a eulogium upon England as the source from which we have derived every thing that is valuable

in science and arts, in literature, law, and politics.

When I am reminded of the greatness of England, as that the same England which gave them birth, and should have felt a mother's pride and love in their virtues and famy in all coming time, for the very causes which have advisers desired an exclusive privilege to be acquired. endeared them to us and filled the republican world with their fame! Nor am I unmindful of the debt of gratitude ed, without so changing it as to make an entirely new which the present generation owes to the brilliant galaxy treaty.

of great names whose fortune it was to have been born. The Senator from Illinois has not yentured to deny that of great names whose fortune it was to have been born we have inherited from that source.

perish in the end. Sir, I want the bridle. The very thing which I want is the bridle, to restrain and control, thing which I want is the bridle, to restrain and control, and not altogether the spurs, to drive you on with ruin-ous impetuously. Treating must be reserved to. They are not only objectionable on the ground that was a perpetual; and yet we know that they never have been perpetual. They impose upon the parties of the bridgetion of good faith; they are leagues of homosphere the both parties to remodel and amend them by mutual constitution, but the progress of events. It may become the interest of both parties to remodel and amend them by mutual constitution, but the progress of events. They are founded upon the assumption of the confined to review the obligation of good faith; they are leagues of homosphine the progress of events. It may become the interest of both parties to remodel and amend them by mutual constitution, but the progress of events. They are considered the progress of events. They are founded upon the assumption that mutual good faith; they are leagues of homosphine to remodel and amend them by mutual constitution, but the progress of events. They are considered the progress of events. They are considered the progress of events are the progress of events. They are considered to the progress of events are the progress of events. They are considered to the progress of events. They are considered the progress of events. They are considered to the progress of events. They are conside out the land. Is he not aware that nearly every English of nations, must furnish its own justification, and such as book circulated and read in this country contains lurking annot be the subject of definite prescription. our people and the institutions and policy of our Govern-ment? Does he not know that abolitionism, which has acquisition, or something of the same import. Now, it may so seriously threatened the peace and safety of this Refollow that we may not have to take Mexico against her public, had its origin in England, and has been incorpora-

ted into the policy of that Government for the purpose of operating upon the peculiar institutions of some of the States of this Confederacy, and thus render the Union itself insecure? Does she not keep her missionaries per ambulating this country, delivering lectures and scatter-ing broadcast incendiary publications, designed to incite prejudices, hate, and strife between the different sections of this Union? I had supposed that South Carolina and the other slaveholding States of this Confederacy had been sufficiently refreshed and enlightened by a certain species of English literature, designed to stir up treason and insurrection around his own fire-side, to have excused the Senator from offering up praises and hosannas to our appeal. But history and posterity are the tribunals to English mother! [Applause in the galleries.] Is not the heart, intellect, and press of England this moment employed in flooding America with this species of "Eng-lish literature?" Even the wives and daughters of the erect for our own pleadings upon a subject of this literature?" Even the wives and dauguters of In looking to such a judgment, we, as the parties, must lish literature?" Even the wives and dauguters of not exclusively consult the dictates of our own interests. nobility and the high officers of Government have had the presumption to address the women of America, and in the presumption to address the women of America, and in the presumption to address the women of them to engage in the name of philanthropy appeal to them to engage in the treasonable plot against the institutions and Government of their own choice in their native land, while millions ar-being expended to distribute "Uncle Tom's Cabin" throughout the world, with the view of combining the fanaticism, ignorance, and hatred of all the nations of the earth in a common crusade against the peculiar institutions of the State and section of this Union represented by the Senator from South Carolina; and he unwittingly encourages it, by giving vent to his rapturous highly-flattering picture of her prosperity. But when joy over these copious and refreshing streams with which with taunting disparagement he spoke of the decrepitude England is irrigating the American intellect. [Renewed England is irrigating the American intellect. [Renewed]

applause in the galleries.]
The Presiding Officer, (Mr. Rusk in the chair.) There must be order in the galleries. If there is not, they will Mr. Adams. I desire to ask that the galleries may be cleared if such an outrage occurs again.

Mr. Douglas. I hope it will be done. It is manifestly improper to have such proceedings in the galleries. The Presiding Officer. It certainly will be done,

the same thing occurs again. Mr. BUTLER. I have but one word to say in reply to the Senator from Illinois. When I spoke of our gratitude to Y gland, I did not allude to the sentimental kind of Ature to which the Senator refers. I thought I indi-We may claim to be her peer, but we nevertheless of ed the authors of the literature to which I referred; are her debtor.

Sir, when we despise England, we must despise the very and indicating impure streams, as if they had a connexgad I do not thank the Senator for going out of his way, soil in which grew the tree from whose fruits we have been | ion with my remark; for there are impure streams flowing from other sources besides Great Britain; and there are any great naval Power the canal would be seized impure examples in other parts of the world besides Great Britain. When I spoke of it, I spoke in emphatic terms than any other nation? If he does, I differ from him. I of those writers who have poured upon us what the Senado not say that I have any especial love for any nation. tor himself will not deny to be refreshing streams; what And then we must garrison them, and keep a standing make an appeal successfully to the vulgar passions, in or-I hope he will regard as refreshing to him, and to the inlove our own country—a sentiment of patriotism inspires telligence of the age. I named authors. Will he dissent son a fortress if England and France, or either of them, that feeling. But as to other nations, we have feelings and from Burke? Will he dissent from Chatham? Will he should go to war with us? How many would the Senator dissent from Shakspeare? Will he dissent from the literamore respect and regard than for others. But, sir, I say ture and the eloquence and the example and the tone of here, in my place, if the word love be a werd of prefer-feeling of Hampden and Sidney? Sir, when I spoke in to any other nation on earth. I do not hesitate to say, in to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." [Laughter.] That may do for the sense I have spoken, that I love her more than any other foreign nation on earth. England, in our origin, what I said in relation to the literature of England.

Mr. Douglas. I spoke in terms of reverence and revernacular language, she is our mother country. The spect of the monuments and tombstones which were found in England, to the great men, to their patriotism, to their country with any nation on earth—not he! He must him would suppose that we had entered into some great From what country do we derive the maxims, the spi-rit, the institutions, the safeguards of our liberty? Have great and noble and admirable. I spoke of them with renot the streams of her literature been poured out upon spect as a matter in the past; but, sir, I do not think it us? Have we not all drunk of them with delight and was a legitimate argument to go back two or three centu-

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to know he

Mr. Douglas. I would neither postpone nor Mr. BUTLER. I have pronounced no other eulogium lization, and we are bound to maintain our relations with Senator has brought in debate. We can find this miser-Mr. Butler. Lithink the Mexican treaty was sent as able sentimentality any where, and there are many other Mr. Douglas. The President sent it in, stating that there were certain provisions in it which must be stricken out before at could be sanctioued by him. But now as to another point: The gentleman commenced have no around the point of the leading engagement in our own treaty and every other treaty of commerce with any solutions of the leading engagement in our own treaty and every other treaty of commerce with any solutions of the leading engagement in our own treaty and every other treaty of commerce with any solutions of the leading engagement in our own treaty and every other treaty of commerce with any own another point: The gentleman commented upon a remark to confine the debate to the points at issue between the that I had made, and which also was contained in the let- Senator from Delaware and myself, and I have not depart-

> SPEECH OF MR. JOHN M. CLAYTON, OF DELAWARE

In reply to Mr. MASON and Mr. DOUGLAS, in vin ion of the Central American Treaty concluded with Great Britain on the 19th of April, 1850.

IN SENATE, MARCH 16, 1853. Mr. Douglas having replied to Mr. CLAYTON, and Mr. BUTLER having spoken-

Mr. CLAYTON said: The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. BUTLER) will recellect how this discussion, in open session, was forced upon me. It was introduced here by session, was forced upon me. It was introduced here by the member from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas,) on the 14th of February, and I was compelled to defend myself in open because the Senate permitted the attack to be The Senator referred to a remark of mine in regard to made in open session. I wish no concealment, and do the decay and decline of European Powers, and made it not mean to permit the member from Illinois to escape an exposure in public of the misstatements he has pub licly made. He shall not avoid the notice of his own changes of position, by charging the same things on me.

The Senator from South Carolina justly considers the ous names of Hampden and Sidney are pointed to as examples, I cannot fail to remember—I can never forget—

Senate for ratification. Such a course would have implied his approbation of it. In the event that England had refused all our proposals for an equal right of passervices, persecuted her noble sons to the dungeon and sage, he might have sent it to the Senate, if he had deem-the scaffold, and attempted to brand their names with ined it expedient, to ascertain whether his constitutional

and to have suffered in England, and whose labors and the treaty was unconstitutional as it stood. He evades researches in political, legal, and physical sciences, in literature, poetry, and art, have added so much lustre to their native land. Some pursue their labors under the protection and patronage of England, others in defiance

The defiance is that point, because he knows he cannot defend his favorite Hise treaty as a constitutional measure for a moment. He dared not attempt to defend it, after I had exposed it. Yet he had committed himself in favor of it by at least of her tyranny and vengeance. I award all credit and four or five electioneering speeches last summer, (one of praise to the authors of all the blessings and advantages which he made and published at Richmond,) and by his Dare not attempt to repair it, or use any means to proe have inherited from that source.

I cannot go as far as the Senator from South Carolina. how to retreat without discredit. When I read his Hise clusive honor of that." A mere restatement of such a I cannot recognise England as our mother. If so, she is and ever has been a cruel and unnatural mother. I do not find the evidence of her affection in her watchfulness ance to his feelings, but I will venture to say it astonish-

satisfied with nothing but an exclusive fight or monopoly vested in us. He misrepresents the contract obtained by American citizens, and intended to be protected by the treaty of Mr. Squier, when he says that grant was a grant to English as well as American capitalists. It was a grant to American capitalists.

Mr. Douglas. The Senator misunderstood me. I did not speak of the specific terms of the treaty of Mr. Squier, for the reason that the injunction of secrecy has not yet been removed, although I saw some papers friendly to the Senator putting some sections of it in the paper.

Mr. CLAYTON. What papers? Mr. Douglas. A New York paper did it the other day. I only spoke of the general terms used by Mr. Squier, and published by the Senator in 1850. But when I said that it opened to England and to us jointly, I spoke of the Senator having provided for that in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. Clayron. The whole contract protected by the

Squier treaty, of which I was speaking, was published two years ago, and is in a document before Congress. Mr. Douglas. I was speaking of the treaty.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then why did you interrupt me? You knew I was speaking of the contract or grant, and not of the treaty. The substance of the treaty was published long ago. It has been published at least two years; and there is not any thing in it or the grant about a partnership between European and American capitalists.
Mr. Douglas. Will the Senator say that the Squier

treaty has been published by authority Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir, but you know the substance of it was published long ago, and the injunction of secrecy has long since been taken off the treaty of the 19th of April, 1850, which discloses the principle of both. The April, 1850, which discloses the principle of both. The sell the information before me, including that obtained Senator has shown that he has not the slightest difficulty from Lord Palmerston himself, as well as from my own in speaking of either of these treaties, or of any thing connected with either of them.

changes his ground in his reply. But I mean to bring him back to the points from which he seeks to escape. He has not attempted, in his reply, to fasten on me, as he endeavored to do in the beginning of the debate, and as he did in his speech of the 14th of February, the charge that I had, in negotiating the treaty of the 19th of April, 1850, abnegated, as he expressed it, the Monroe doctrine. No, sir; he has abandoned that, and he will not venture to touch it again. He has good reason to shun it, for it burnt his fingers. He has fled from it. He cannot now vindicate a word he uttered on that subject. He beats a retreat.

Mr. Douglas. No, sir; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. Douglas. No, sir; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. Douglas. No, sir; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then he is not willing to retreat, after he has become totally silenced on the subject, and ceased to make battle. Now, a word as to his favorite exclusive privilege.

we had it, it would involve us in controversies with all other nations, and would prove a curse instead of a bless-ing. In the event of a war between this country and have agreed to a certain extent that they have the right Senator fears nothing—oh no, not he! He would fortify it at both ends! Yes, sir; build a fort at both ends!—a fort at San Juan de Nicaragua and a feat at high the Senator mean to condemn condenn are the senator mean to condemn condenn as the Senator mean to condemn condenn are the senator mean to condenn cond fort at San Juan de Nicaragua, and a fort on the Pacific. army there! How many soldiers would it take to garrison a fortress if England and France, or either of them, have at San Juan? How many on the Pacific? Does he suppose that any force that this country could possibly great Powers of the world in a war? He is fond of boast- which regulate at our tonnage and import duties, and all ing (and I love to hear it-it is quite flattering) that we are a giant republic; and the Senator himself is said to be a "little giant." [Laughter.] Yes, sir, quite a giant; and every thing that he talks about in these latter days is gigantic. [Laughter.] He has become so magnificent of clusive privilege at Gfbraltar? What is the difference in the passage across the isthmus? Mr. Douglas. Will the Senator permit me ?-

I am willing to hear him when I have done.

Mr. Douglas. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator but I understand him to ask me, and look for an answer. Mr. CLAYTON. Let him be quiet. He meant to say that one is a European and the other an American passage. That is all he had to say. And, as the distinction is without a difference. I do not desire to hear him. Knowing

abuse of her. But, Mr. President, as is sometimes the case, I have spoken beyond what I intended when I rose, and take my seat.

England is not the only place in which it is found. She does not merely arraign me; he arraigns all those constitutional advisers of the President of the United States.

His own colleague (Mr. Shields) was among the num-Mr. Douglas. In reply to the honorable Senator from in all our commercial relations, in all our connexion with ber who voted for the treaty. Most of the distinguished Mr. Douglas. In reply to the honorable Senator from the first of the controversy as to which is the right policy for the tor would not be disposed to postpone her to any other. You, yourself, Mr. President, were one of the men who preclaimed the same principle, by voting for the treaty with New Grenada. This doctrine of the exclusive right to make, construct, and protect a canal outside the limits of the United States was not known to the states men who lived fourteen years ago. Sir, it was a stranger to the statesmen who have governed this country for a

quarter of a century.

The Senator denied again that I had a right to use the of the treaty. I stated the fact that Livingston, the Secretary of State under Jackson, had proclaimed, on the 20th of July, 1831, the hostility of this Government to any thing like an exclusive privilege through that canal. The letter of Mr. Livingston to Mr. Jeffers, of that date, is decisive of the sentiments of President Jackson, on the ground that an exclusive privilege in any one nation to present that conclusive objection to any grant of exclusive privilege to the Dutch capitalists who, under the patronage of the King of the Netherlands, had applied for erament. and obtained a grant to cut the canal at Nicaragua. It in favor of the doctrine of the treaty, of the Dutch Govern ment and its great chief himself-a man on whom I have no time to pronounce a eulogy, but who has been aulo-gized by men who were quite capable of conferring dis-tinction, by any thing they might say, as even the Senator from Illinois himself. At the distance of nearly a therefore authorized to use the word 'us,' when speaking quarter of a century ago, when desiring to open the great of the rights and privileges to be acquired of a foreign evenue to the Pacific, he did not dream of such a thing nation through his agency as Secretary of State?" as the exclusive privilege. His contract, which I have before me, provided for opening the canal which he pro-jected to all the nations of the earth on the same terms; and, in fact, there is not a principle established by the sentatives in its resolution of 1839, and by the concurrent action of Presidents Jackson, Polk, and Taylor, that

Mr. President, I do not at all of is not in accordance with the principle established by the capitalists who were patronized by the Dutch Government. Foreigners have not adopted the narrow and contracted. His statement that the clause guarantying the indepenpolicy which so commended itself to the member from Il-linois, of procuring an exclusive right over a canal which no one State could possibly maintain and protect in the face of the great commercial nations of the earth. the exclusive right, he would not keep it, not he! He ish Government, our interests upon a just and satisfactory

was too liberal, too generous, too fair towards other naclusive honor of that." A mere restatement of such a proposition seems to me to make it absolutely unnecessary

and ever has been a cruel and unnatural mother. I do not find the evidence of her affection in her watchfulness over our infancy, nor in her joy and pride at our everblooming prosperity and swelling power, since we assumblooming prosperity and swelling power, since we assumble on independent position. The proposition is not historically true. Our ancestry were not all of English origin. They were of Scoth, Irish, German, French, and of Norman descent as well as Engto comment upon it.

Sir, the right of way was secured by American capitalists, aided by all the efforts the Minister sent by President Taylor to Central America could make. The Senator ought to have known it was granted to American citizens at the very moment he charged me with the loss of it. He has repeatedly said we had obtained it by a grant to English and American capitalists. At the same time, if he had read the public documents sent to Congress on a subject about which he has talked more than any other living man, he would have known that statement was incorrect, and that the grant was made on the application of American capitalists to themselves. The Pres of American capitalists to themselves. The President did all he had a right to do to encourage and protect it. If these capitalists construct a ship canal, England will protect it, the United States will protect it, and every other civilized nation we apply to will protect it when ac-

complished, because no nation can be or ought to be en-titled to use it except upon the terms of agreeing to protect it. England agrees, by the treaty, to assist us, not only in protecting this ship canal, but any railroad or ship canal that can be made through the whole isthmus. We have no interest that I am aware of to prefer the route by way of Nicaragua to that by Tehuantepec. If we could obtain a canal route nearer our country than either Nicaragua or Panama, we ought to prefer it. Undoubtedly, if we could obtain the Tehuantepec route, we ought to prefer that; but if we cannot obtain a passage at a point nearer to us than the southern part of the Isthmus of Darien, it is of the deepest interest to this country to have it at that point. Pains were taken, as the Sena-tor will know by looking into the correspondence, to as certain which was the most practicable route; and from countrymen, the route believed to be the most easily practicable was through Nicaragua. Whether it is the best The Senator presents new issues for discussion, and route, I am not at all interested to affirm or deny; for in the senator presents new issues for discussion, and a ship canal can be obtained anywhere through that isthmus, the treaty I signed protects it, and insures to my countrymen the right of passage through it; and we have no longer any cause for such jealousy as was entertained by President Jackson and Mr. Livingston, the Secretary of State, in 1831. No matter who may construct this or any other canal, in any part of the whole isthmus between

nation to interfere it the affairs of this continent. Government has, to a much greater extent, recegnised their right to claim in equality of commercial privileges, from its very origin, by every commercial treaty which it has ever made. You have made your commercial treawhich we have ever made? Does he think that he can der to make this treaty odious, and thereby to make the men in the Senate of the United States who voted for it odious? We never made a treaty of any kind with a European Power which does not acknowledge to as great an extent, or greater the right of European interference in there, at that distance from us, could resist the other the affairs of this continent. He has voted for treaties our commercial intercourse with them. We have made treaties with then to control our own boundaries, and legislative arrangements to control our most important po-litical and commercial interests.

The Senator has rung the changes on the word " parthave the exclusive right in himself and our noble selves! joint-stock mercantile establishment with England. You We must own the canal! Why not demand the same ex- might as well say that all men living near a navigable river, or a turnpike road, or a railroad, had entered into Why should we not seek to obtain the exclu- a partnership, as to say that the nations of the earth about sive right of passage into the Mediterranean, as well as to travel this highway on the same terms had entered into a "partnership." Every man in the District of Columbia has entered into a partnership about Pennsylvania avenue Mr. CLAYTON. If he is anxious to make more remarks, am willing to hear him when I have done.

Mr. Douglas. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator; interested to protect it, and we would protect it.

The reference made by the Senator to the instructions to our Chargé d'Affaires in Central America, to prove that he was directed to oppose the treaty of Mr. Hise, is evidence of a degree of recklessness or folly of which I should ferring to a contract are construed by him to refer to a I endeavored to correct him at the time he retreaty. canal," with a treaty to protect it. His remarks on this subject, compared with the quotation which he has made to Sp cited from my instructions, with a view to show the injustice of his remarks. The instructions say :

" See that it [the contract or grant] is not assignable t others," [meaning to others than the capitalists-the Ameris who obtained it: I "that no exclusive privileger are granted to any nation that will not agree to the same treaty stipulations with Nicaragua; that the tolls to be demanded by the owners are not unreasonable or oppressive; that no power be reserved to THE PROPRIETORS OF THE CANAL OR THEIR SUCCESSORS to extort at any time hereafter, or unjuto obstruct or embarrars, the mour or passage. This will require all your vigilance and skill. If there do not agree to guant us passage on reasonable and proper terms, refuse our protection and our countenance to procure the contract from

"If a CHARTER OF GRANT OF THE RIGHT OF WAY shall have been inceptiously or inconsiderately made before your arrival in that country, seek to have it properly modified to answer the ends we have in view."

The Senator's ignorance of this plain language is un for it, with the treaty between Nicaragua and this Gov-

I interrupted him, and explained it to him; and the was, as I stated before, ascertained that there was no ex-clusive privilege granted to or asked for by the King of the more strongly he seemed to adhere to his error. He I said, therefore, I had the authority, knew well enough that the word "us" referred to our countrymen. The instructions say, "If they [the com-pany] do not agree to grant us [Americans] passage on reasonable and proper terms, refuse our protection, He knew well enough what this meant; yet he put to me the question, "Was he [I] one of the company, and surely did not mean, by putting such a question to me, to Senate in its resolution of 1835, by the House of Repre- here with falsehood, but, with all possible politeness, I

Mr. President, I do not at all object to any statement of dence of Nicaragua was not one of the reasons which induced me to withhold the Hise treaty from the Senate, is alpably incorrect. To sustain himself in his assertion, he refers to my letter to Mr. Lawrence of the 20th Octo-But the Senator said-and I must call the attention of ber, 1849. The very passage he has cited shows that "if foundation, should prove abortive, (that is, upon the foun tions of the earth to keep any such thing! As soon as he obtained his exclusive right, and made his canal, and dent will not he itate to submit this or some other treaty. had the monopoly of navigating it; as soon as he had fortified it and protected it, so as to compel other nations to respect it, he would turn round and give to every body leges to all nations) "which may be concluded by the pre-(that is, the treaty of Hise or the treaty of Squier; the I have the sole burden of keeping up all the repairs, if any of you desire to travel upon it, on the same terms the Senate which would grant us the right of way on the most favorable terms, without regard to the interests of Great Britain. We should have been perfectly justified in endeavoring to exclude her, if we saw evidently that she intended to exclude us; and we desired her fairly to understand that. The very quotation from the instruc-tions to Mr. Lawrence which he has made proves that he

submit this or some other treaty which may be concluded by the present Chargé d'Affaires to Guatemala to the Senate of the United States, for their advice and consent, with a view to its ratification; and, if that enlightened body should approve it, he also will give it his hearty sanction, and will exert all his constitutional power to execute its provisions in good taith, a determination in which he may confidently count upon the good-will of the people of the United States.

It is impossible to reason with one who says he does not understand the object for which this passage in the despatch was written. But he has quoted another passage from the same de spatch. I could not wish to expose him more effectually

than by quoting it myself. It is as follows : "You may suggest, for instance, that the United States and Great Britain should enter into a treaty guarantying the independence of Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica, which treaty may also guaranty to British subjects the privileges ac-quired in those States by the treaties between Great Britain and Spain, provided that the limits of those States on the east be acknowledged to be the Caribbean sea."

After citing this, he gravely asks me, "What has become of my objection to the guaranty of the independence of Nicaragua?" His question scarcely deserves an answer. Great Britain was in possession of the country, in virtue of the protectorate, and we were not; and the proposition made to her was, that she should not only aban don it, but also guaranty the independence of the Central American States adjoining the proposed canal. The Se-nator is incapable of perceiving the difference between a treaty of the United States and Nicaragua, guarantying the independence of Nicaragua, and a treaty of the United States and Great Britain jointly on the one part, and Nicaragua on the other, for the same purpose. If Great Britain had joined us in such a treaty, we should have readily reached our whole object. She refused to accode to this proposition; and it was palpably a suggestion to ascertain her views. The separate guaranty of indepen-dence by us alone was indeed an objection to the Hise treaty, and it was one among many other objections which made the whole insurmountable. Our separate guarantee was a guarantee against Great Britain, the party in possession. A joint guarantee with her was liable to no such exception, and could not possibly entangle us.

The Schator is guilty of so many other misstatements that it is a difficult matter to correct them all. He says that I voted for the Mexican treaty of peace-the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—according to his recollection. His recollection is in this respect, as in many others, entirely at fault. The record shows that I did not vote upon

the treaty.

His statement that the Hise treaty was evidence of the fact that Nicaragua was willing and anxious to grant to the United States forever the exclusive right and control over a ship canal between the two oceans, is contradicted by the letter of Carcache, the Nicaraguan Minister, who leclares she rejected it after it had been signed by Senor Selva, the commissioner on her part. The treaty was evi-dence of extreme folly, and of little else beside.

The Senator recurs again to his objection that the convention will not permit us to annex Central America, and points with triumph to a passage in the letter of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Evergert,) to the Compte de Sartiges, in which he expresses a doubt whether the constitution would permit us, w the tripartite treaty proposed by France and England. to declare that we would never purchase Cuba. The Senator from Illinois held this up as a conclusive authority to prove that the treaty of the 19th April, 1850, was up constitutional. He did not venture to argue this position. The treaty of 1850 was referred to the Committee on For-eign Relations, of which Daniel Webster, of Massachu etts, was at the time a member, who joined in reporting the treaty and in voting for it: did he not understand the constitution? Without referring to all the other distinguished jurists who voted for it, or to the numerous treaties in which this Government has defined the limits of its own territory as perpetual, including the Ashburton treaty, and the treaty of Ghent, and the treaty with Mexico, and I know not how many others, I say to the Senator from Illinois that I acknowledge a wide distinction between the purchase of Cuba and the annexation of Central America. Cuba was not in the possession of Great Britain, under the name of a protectorate or otherwise. A large part of Central America was. We had no canal A large part of Central America was. We had no canal to make in Cuba. She presented no obstacle to us in our passage to California and Oregon. Central America did. Sir, I do most cordially concur in all the encominum upon the letter of my friend from Massachusetts. I approved of all the policy of President Fillmore in regard to Cuba while my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr

EVERETT.) was at the head of the Department of State. President Taylor, at an early period of his Administration, was informed of the substance of Mr. Forsyth's let ter, which has been since published, instructing our minister at Madrid to say to the Spanish Governme would defend the title of Spain to Cuba with all the naval of the right of way," made to "the proprietors of the and military power of the United States. I thought it impolitic, as it led, of course, to a similar communication sain from Great Britain and France. The French from the instructions, will convict him without any ex-posure from me. I will quote the whole passage he has her a similar guarantee against us. The assurance of the United States, Great Britain, and France, thus made to Spain, virtually guarantying Cuba to Spain, was equal in efficacy to any tripartite treaty that could have be cluded. By the President's direction, I did not continue the assurance on our part.

I allude to this as illustrating the identical policy adout. ed by my honorable friend from Massachusetts, in his letter to the Compte de Sartiges. Our minister at Madrid was instructed, on the 2d of August, 1849, that the President could not comprehend or appreciate the motives or expediency of openly declaring to Spain that the whole power of the United States would be employed to prevent the occupation in whole or in part of Cuba from passing into other hands, because he had reason to believe that this declaration of Mr. Forsyth, on our part, had led to counter declarations to Spain of a similar character by other interested Powers; that whilst this Government was resolutely determined that the Island of Cuba should accountable. He had confounded the grant of the right never be ceded by Spain to any other Power than the of way or charter to the company of Americans who asked United States, it did not desire, in future, to enter into any guarantees with Spain on that subject; that, without guarantees, we should be ready, when the time came, to act; that the news of the cession of Cuba to any foreign Power would, in the United States, be the instant signal for war; and that no foreign Power would attempt to take it that did not expect a hostile collision with us as an in-

evitable consequence. This discontinuance, or revocation, of Mr. Forsyth's declaration, which had bound this Government for so many years, was not exactly a refusal to agree to such a tripartite convention, as was very properly rejected by my hon-orable friend from Massachusetts, but it was the first instance in which this Government gave unmistakable evidence of its policy not to agree to any such convention.

Sir, the Senator said that I had abolished the Monroe

doctrine. If I have really done that, I have done more than I ever thought I was capable of doing. If I have done that, I have abolished a fruitful source of controversy between my own country and other nations. But how and in what sense have I abolished the Monroe doc-One of the principles on which I acted, in the formation of the treaty, was the exclusion of a European nation from further interference on a part of this continent. Was that exclusion an abolition of the Monroe doctrine? Will he tell me of any instance in the history of this country in which any other Administration has carried out the Monroe doctrine in the same way, or in any other way? Can be find any other instance in which there has been the slightest approximation to it

As to the Indian protectorate in Nicaragua, I have only to say of it as I said before, " Stat nominie umbra "-it

stands, the shadow of a name!

European nations from this continent. When he discourses in such magnificent terms as he employed a few years ago 'about fifty-four forty or fight," he does no harm among his own countrymen. We all know exactly what it means. But when these speeches reach the other side of the Atelse in the would turn round and give to every body else in the world the right to go through it at our expense! Is not that a magnificent conception? When my neighbors propose to make a highway, I say: "No, you shall not. No man shall dare to spend a dollar on it. I will have the exclusive right of way! I will make the highway; but after I have gone to the expense of making it, and while I have the sole burden of keeping up all the repairs, if any of you desire to travel upon it, on the same terms to all other men be concluded by the present the world the repairs of "which may be concluded by the present of the concluded by the present of the concluded by the present of the world the repairs of "which may be concluded by the present of the concluded by th to be understood among them that we are bent upon seiz ing every country to which we may take a fancy, we shall be looked upon as pirates and enemies of the human race. Then it will be found that, instead of maintaining the highest position upon earth, we have descended to the lowest, and the sun of our glory will set forever. I am, and profess to be, an American in heart-every inch an American; as determined to assert and enforce respect for American rights, and the duty of protecting American interests at home and abroad, as any man; but I am also resolved to assert and maintain American faith and honor. Let us proclaim it among all the nations of the earth that there does not exist under the sun a people more proud He looked quite hearty, and appeared to e of observing and maintaining their treaties and all their tainment with infinite relish—Einston Bee.

contracts than the people of the United States. Let us discountenance this system, now practised by the Senator from Illinois and others among us, of denouncing Euro-peans, and of inculcating it as a duty to hate the men of any other nation. I cannot express my sentiments on the subject in more appropriate terms, than by asking the Secretary to read a passage from the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country. Let us refresh and strengthen ourselves, at the close of this turbulent debate, by a resort to that fountain whose bright waters have never fail ed to invigorate us.

[The Clerk read it, as follows: Nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate "Nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cuftivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness, is, in some degree, a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be hunghty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government; contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts, through passion, what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambisubservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the

"So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for "So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the fuccrite nation of privileges decied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what onely to have been rewhich is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom EQUAL PRIVILEURS are withheld: And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a landable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation."] or infatuation."]

Mr. President, I have done. The first resolution which offered, calling for information, has been passed, and the other may sleep upon the table, if I can be assured that the information sought by it can be had, as it ought to be, without it. I am quite indifferent to its fate. My chief object was to defend my own position, and that ject has been accomplished.

FEEDING AND MANAGEMENT OF FAT STOCK.

The feeding and management of fat stock, immediately prior to being slaughtered, is a subject quite as in-teresting to the farmer as to the butcher; for if the whole weight which left the feeding-box were placed in the scales, the former would be a gainer by the difference between this weight and that of the carcase when slaughtered—the actual weight which the latter now pays for. There are two very important practical questions involved in this subject. The one relates to the daily amount of waste which takes place under the various nodes of management during marketing from the time stock leaves home until led to the slaughter-house; and the other relates to the quantity and quality of food which ought to be consumed during that period.

What, for instance, is the daily waste upon an ox of 100 imperial stones, carcase weight, when sent to the metropolis, between the time it leaves home until slaugh-tered, and what the quantity and quality of food which such an ex ought to consume, and the treatment it should otherwise receive, so as to maintain it at this weight un-deteriorated in quality? The amount of daily waste will epend very much upon the constitution of the animal, the state of the weather, the food and treatment prior to leavng home, as well as upon the food and treatment between ome and the shambles; consequently, from the diversity of constitution, food, and treatment, there may scarcely be two animals in Smithfield of this weight whose daily waste is equal. A five-year old Highlander or Galloway, for instance, accustomed to exercise, exposure, and inferior food, may lose little more, comparatively speaking, than the ordinary daily waste in the straw yard prior to leaving home; and this to a certain amount may be repaired by the quantity of hay consumed—a species of food somewhat better than many of this class are yet accustomed to at home; while, on the other hand, the quicky-grown short-horn or Hereford, accustomed to better d and treatment, and which has attained to this weight by the time it has completed its second year, will be in a very different position; for at this age their bones will be comparatively green, their hoofs soft and tender, and their whole system in an artificial state, demanding treatment very different from that which they generally receive. In two examples of this kind the latter may lose weight at the rate of two imperial stones daily, while the former may not exceed one. And differences almost as great may exist in this respect between individuals of any symmetry, are very active and hardy, and easily satisfied as to quality of food; and therefore the daily waste upon them may not be the half of what it is in others of the same breed possessing inferior constitution; and the same

will be found true of Herefords, Devons, Galloways, &c. The food and treatment of the ox between the stall and the shambles is a more complex question, being surrounded with many more difficulties than that of daily waste. As a general rule, it may be laid down that the ox should receive the same species of food after it leaves home, un-til within twelve hours of being slaughtered, that it has been accustomed to; and that where turnips, oil-cake, &c. are given-articles which affect the quality of the butchereat when slaughtered-these should be changed before leaving home, and others, such as bruised oats or other corn, substituted in their place; also, that treatment after leaving home should be as similar to treatment before it as possible.

The rationals of this practice is sufficiently obvious. It is that which is endeavored to be carried out at all our great cattle shows, and the difficulty there experienced is o get cattle to consume a sufficiency of food. Pampered nature, overloaded with fat, ever active to meet the exigencies of her situation, feels rather disposed to throw off the burden than maintain it at so overpowering a weight, and the same laws will regulate her conduct between the feeding-box of the farmer and the slaughter-house of the butcher. The progress lately made amongst farmers in the art of feeding, both as regards food and household ac-commodation, and the early maturity of breeds, and the change in our commercial policy affording an ample supply of cheap corn to butchers, enable both parties to opt the best policy which science and experience can dictate. And they should endeavor to act in accordance with one another's interest; for if the farmer, for instance, feeds his ox on the full allowance of turnips and oil-cake up to the hour it leaves for market, as is too frequently the case, it may often be impossible for the drover, salesman, and butcher to introduce the necessary change so as present to the public butcher-meat undeteriorated in quality. For a few days, for instance, before the ox leaves home, it should be fed purposely with the view of improving the quality of its flesh; for it is a well-knownfact that turnips, oil cake, and several other articles, con-tain elements which, being readily absorbed into the system, tend to deteriorate the quality of the meat.

Again, the ox should be slaughtered fasting, but not suffering from the cravings of hunger; for when the food is not worked up into the system it affects the quality of the blood, and when hunger is felt the whole nervous system is affected, producing an even greater deterioration of quality in the meat. In practice the safest course to steer will be to slaughter in the morning, giving the ox on the previous evening a somewhat light or spare supper-one requiring little mastication and easily

ach as a handful or two of catmeal along with its drink. The usual and almost only food given to fat stock in the metropolis and other large towns prior to slaughterng is hay, the whole mode of treatment being that of the ourteenth century. The improvements of modern times have made no progress in this quarter; and it is even humiliating to think how far the practice of many farmers tallies with such an anti-quated system. Given, 100 stones of live butcher-ment manufactured from turnips, oil-cake. straw, and hay, for instance; throw down a handful of The Senator is fond of talking violently about driving hay in some dirty confined yard, or corner of a field, to the over-fatigued ox, pampered at home with the above dairties prepared in various ways, and you are supposed to do all that in you lies towards the economical consumer.

of the living animal into butcher-meat.

We have been led to these remarks from our requirements. account of the sales, weight, and character of some of the stock lately exhibited at the Smithfield Club Show, from which it will be seen that a daily waste had railon piege of about two imperial stones on the various unlimits on amined, and that in other respects the quantity and quanty have also been influenced under all the supersor munagement bestowed upon stock in Baker street, and subsequently to the time when they are slaughtered. This being the case, what must the daily waste be under the ordinary system of Smithfield and our other large markets .- Hampshire (Eng.) Advertiser.

There was present at the Howard Atheneum, (Boston, on Monday evening, a gentieman who had attended a theatrical performance in Boston virty years before, and was at man's estate then. He was the venerable John Hancock, of Beacon street, son of the immortal John of Revolutionary memory, and is over eighty years of age. He looked quite hearty, and appeared to enjoy the ease